III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action with mailing date of June 5, 2006. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By the amendment, claims 1, 8, 11, 19, 22 and 30 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 20020120918, hereinafter "Aizenbud", in view of US Patent No. 6732153, hereafter "Jakobsonson." Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection on the following grounds.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Aizenbud in view of Jakobson, Applicant respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 22, Applicants submit that Aizenbud fails to teach, *inter alia,* "...a message <u>sent by a computer program code to an end user...</u>". In support of its contention to the contrary, the Office cites paragraph [0054] of Aizenbud that teaches a "visual program ... performed by processing logic of a message broker ...". As disclosed in [0053], [0050] and [0047] message brokers capabilities are supported

by message flows that operate at a level facilitating communications "...to reconcile differences between systems and applications" or interoperation between application programs running on different systems but not between a system/program and an end user. To this extent, Aizenbud teaches messaging between operating programs and is deficient in providing communication to an end user. Jakobson does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Office's withdrawal of the rejection and allow claim 1, 11 and 22.

With respect to currently amended dependent claim 8, Applicant submits that the cited references also fail to teach, *inter alia*, a configuring step that "... comprises designating a saved resource containing message review parameters for ascertaining a structure of a message...". As noted on page 3 of the current Office Action, the Office admits that Aizenbud does not teach this limitation. Instead, the Office cites col. 6, lines 59–65 and col. 7, lines 45–50 of Jakobson to remedy Aizenbud's deficiency. According to the cited paragraph of col. 6, lines 59–65, Jakobson teaches a Message Class Grammar (MCG) editor allowing "...a programmer to quickly and efficiently edit the (MCG) using a conventional text editor ...". Further to cited paragraph col. 7, lines 45 – 50, Jakobson teaches performing repeated "... parsing on a specific portion of the message... until the terminal node is reached...". However, these cited paragraphs do not explicitly teach or suggest that the editing and parsing is used for "ascertaining a structure of a message" (currently amended claim 8). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the rejection.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to currently

amended claims 1, 11 and 22 and asserts that all claims dependent on the respective independent claims are patentable over the cited references for one or more additional unique features.

Respectfully, Applicant further asserts the foregoing arguments with regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of subject matter in system claims 11 – 20 and computer product claims 22 – 32, which are similar to subject matter in claims 1 - 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections of all claims.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique feature. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesces to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2006

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

HEW/TC